

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4 and 15-21 are pending in the present application. By this reply, new claims 16-21 directed to the elected invention have been added. Non-elected claims 5-14 have been cancelled. Claims 1 and 17 are independent.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-4 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmberg et al. (Holmberg, USPN 6,160,270) in view of Yudasaka et al. (Yudasaka, USPN 5,989,945), and further in view of Mori et al. (Mori, USPN 5,668,650). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner correctly acknowledges that Holmberg does not disclose, *inter alia*, the feature of “applying a mask” in forming the source and drain electrodes, and the features of applying other photoresist patterns by printing, such as a gate photoresist pattern, an active photoresist pattern, a contact hole photoresist pattern, and a pixel electrode photoresist pattern, as recited in claim 1. To overcome these deficiencies of Holmberg, the Examiner further relies on Mori (for the feature of applying the mask) and on Yudasaka (for forming the recited photoresist patterns by printing). The Examiner alleges that Mori and Yudasaka teach or suggest the respective features and that the combination of Mori and Yudasaka with Holmberg as suggested by the Examiner renders the claimed invention obvious. Applicants respectfully disagree at least for the following reasons.

Yudasaka discloses using an ink jet-type liquid coating process to apply a resist on a substrate, so as to form the insulating film, the silicon film (e.g., the silicon film 33 in Fig. 11 of

Yudasaka) and the conductive film; see col. 20, lines 27-33 of Yudasaka. However, Yudasaka nowhere teaches or suggests the feature of applying a *contract hole photoresist pattern by printing* to form a contact hole over the passivation layer, as recited in claim 1. Since none of the applied references teach or suggest this feature, even if the references were combinable (assuming *arguendo*), the combination of references would not teach or suggest the invention as recited in claim 1. New independent claim 17 recite a similar feature in a varying scope.

Furthermore, Yudasaka discloses that such silicon film (33) becomes a source region 33S and a drain region 33D. In other words, Yudasaka suggests forming the source/drain region by using a silicon film formed by a coating process. If so, there is clearly no motivation to use a conventional mask of Mori to form the source/drain region of Holmberg as suggested by the Examiner. Yudasaka's use's of coating process to form the silicon film of the source/drain region clearly teaches away from using a conventional mask to form the same as suggested by Mori. Thus, Mori and Yudasaka cannot be combined with Holmberg as suggested by the Examiner, and the rejection is not proper.

Therefore, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims (due to the dependency) are patentable over the applied references, and the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claim 16 further defines the invention as recited in independent claim 1 and is thus allowable at least for the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable as discussed above.

Independent claim 17 and its dependent claims 18-21 recite similar distinguishing features of the present invention in a varying scope, and are thus believed to be allowable over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final, in that it raises no new issues but merely places the claims in a form more clearly patentable over the references of record. In the alternative, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final in that it reduces the issues for appeal.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther Chong
Esther H. Chong, #40,953

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

EHC/ta